

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-51 were pending and presented for examination in this application. In an Office Action dated October 11, 2007, claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 were rejected.

### **Response to Rejection Under 35 USC 103(a)**

In the 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-6, 8-10, 14-25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Holt et al., US 6,601,061 B1 in view of Gross et al., US Pub. 2004/0143569 A1. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 18 and 24 have been amended to recite elements similar to:

generating and storing in a memory of the client device a local index of a plurality of articles associated with at least one of a user or the client device and stored on the client device, each article having an article type from a plurality of article types, wherein each article type indicates a computer readable data format for an article;

executing on the client device a search query on the local index to produce a first result set of articles relevant to the search query, the first result set referencing a plurality of articles having different article types;

receiving on the client device from a remote search system a second result set from a search of a global index, the second result set relevant to the search query;

receiving, from the user, a selection of user-defined display parameters, including a selection of article types to be displayed at the client device;

generating on the client device a user interface based on the selection of article types to be displayed, wherein the user-interface includes a plurality of spatially segregated sections of a display of the client device wherein each of the segregated sections is associated with one of the selected article types; and

displaying the first and second result sets to the user in the generated user interface of the client device, wherein the plurality of articles in the first result sets are displayed in the plurality of segregated sections according to their article types

These elements allow the user to define a user-interface for controlling the display of local and global search results through the selection of user-defined display parameters including the selection of article types to be displayed, wherein each article type indicates a

computer readable data format for an article. A user-interface is generated, where the user-interface includes a plurality of spatially segregated sections of a display of the client device wherein each of the segregated sections is associated with one of the selected article types. Search results for global and local searches are segregated in the generated user interface with the local search results being displayed in the plurality of segregated sections according to their article types. The display filters the result set from a local search of the client device based on the user selection of article types to be displayed.

FIG. 3 of the specification is one example embodiment that operated in accordance with the claimed method. FIG. 3 illustrates a user defined graphic user interface 301 that includes spatially segregated sections which reference article types of Files 306, Email 304 and Chat messages 308 based on the user selection of article types to be displayed in a set of user-defined display parameters. Search results from a global search of the Web 302 and a local search are displayed in the graphic user interface. Local search results are displayed in the segregated sections for Files 306, Email 204 and Chat Messages 308 according to their article type. In FIG. 3 global and local results are generated using the search term 'flower' and displayed in segregated sections in the generated user interface 301. The segregated section showing local search results from Files 306 is on the left side of the user interface in FIG. 3 and the segregated section showing local search results from Emails 205 on the right side of the user interface.

Neither Gross nor Holt discloses the claimed elements, alone or in combination. Holt is directed to the combination of search results from public and private web pages. Gross is directed to a system for incremental searching as a user enters characters into search fields.

First, Gross fails to disclose elements that govern the filtering of search results or generation of a user-interface such as “user-defined display parameters, including article types to be displayed”, where the article types define a generated “user interface based on the selection of article types to be displayed”. Gross does not appear to allow the user to select which article types to be displayed, thus defining a user interface based on selection of article types.

Second, Gross does not disclose “generating on the client device **a user interface based on user selection of article types to be displayed** wherein the user-interface includes a plurality of spatially segregated sections of the client device display wherein each of the segregated sections reference one of the selected article types”. The Examiner suggested that Holt disclosed “generating on the client device a user interface based on article types to be displayed, the user interface including a combined display of the first results set and the second result set” and cited to Fig. 1 of Holt which merely shows a computer system. This analysis by the Examiner ignores the claim limitation that the user interface is “based upon on article types to be displayed” and also the antecedent basis of the first result set such as, “a search query on the local index to produce a first result set of articles relevant to the search query, the first result set referencing a plurality of articles having different article types.” As acknowledged by the Examiner in her rejection, Holt fails to disclose local search results. Holt merely discloses combining public and private global search results, not “generating on the client device a user interface **based on article types to be displayed**, the user interface including a combined display of the first results set and the second result set” as claimed.

Third, Gross further fails to disclose “displaying the first and second result sets to the user in the generated user interface of the client device, wherein the plurality of articles in

the first result sets are displayed in the plurality of segregated sections according to their article types”. This failure to teach or disclose segregation of search results according to result set is made apparent, for example, in FIGS. 3A-3H of Gross. The Examiner interpreted each individual search result in Gross as a result set; this is incorrect. As explained to the Examiner, FIG. 3B of Gross, for example, shows only a single list of search results on the left side of the screen at 308B; the currently selected result is shown in detail at 310B on the right side. Thus Gross does not show first and second results at the same time in a segregated manner.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1, 18 and 24, as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over Gross and Holt. Claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 depend from claims 1, 18 and 24. Claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 also recite elements not disclosed by the cited art. Thus, Applicants submit that claims 3-6, 8-10, 14-17, 19-23, 25, 27-29, 31 and 33-51 are patentably distinguishable over the cited art.

### **Summary**

In sum, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims as presented herein, are patentably distinguishable over the cited references (including references cited, but not applied). Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of the basis for the rejections to these claims and request allowance of them.

In addition, Applicants respectfully invite Examiner to contact Applicants’ representative at the number provided below if Examiner believes it will help expedite furtherance of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

David Marmaros, et al.

Date: October 26, 2007

By: /Robert R. Sachs/

Robert R. Sachs, Reg. No. 42,120

Attorney for Applicants  
Fenwick & West LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Tel.: (415) 875-2410  
Fax: (415) 281-1350